



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,743	05/09/2001	James Nolan	00-388-A	4067
7590 Kevin E. Noonan McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff 32nd Floor 300 S. Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606			EXAMINER SOROUSH, LAYLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/851,743	Applicant(s) NOLAN	
	Examiner Layla Soroush	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 13-16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 28-31 and 33-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-7, 13-16, 18-19, 25-26, 28-31, 33-35, 36-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 1, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1, 47, 49-51, and 55 are pending.

See rejections below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 13-16, 18-19, 25-26, 28-31, 33-35, 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banknieder et al US Patent 4,751,243 in view of York US Patent 4,600,717 and DiPiro et al Pharmacotherapy, A Pathophysiologic Approach, 2nd ed. Elsevier Pub, pp. 41-46.

The scope of the instant claims is viewed given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. Accordingly, the claims are directed to methods of identifying a compound for treatment of wounds to dermis or epidermis of

Art Unit: 1617

external body surface in a diabetic animal, which also includes ophthalmic wounds. The method comprises producing a wound at a site of interest, expose the wound topically to an aldose reductase inhibitor, and assess the rate of wound healing. Claims 2 and 14 further require assessing the efficacy of another compound against the employed aldose reductase inhibitor.

Banknieder discloses methods of improving wound healing by administering an effective amount of tolrestat, which is an aldose reductase inhibitor compound to a patient. (abstract). Banknieder discloses methods of identifying the efficacy of tolrestat as a compound for healing wounds in diabetic rats against controlled subjects. (see col 2, line 13-col 3, line 20). Banknieder created a wound in diabetic animal models, treated the animals with controls, regular diet and tolrestat doses and subsequently determined that rats that were treated with had improved wound healing (see entire col 2-3; claims 1-5). The wounds created by Banknieder is on the skin and thus on the dermis or epidermis of the subjects. The controls and regular diet of Banknieder's Group III meets the limitations of the instant claim 2 and 14 of comparing wounds in the presence of a test compound, because at least the instantly recited test compounds encompass the regular diet of Banknieder. Banknieder further claims methods of treating human with wounds from diabetes mellitus. Banknieder only fails to administer his aldose reductase inhibitor topically the epidermis or dermis wound and use punch biopsy to produce the wound.

York shows topical administration of aldose reductase inhibitors in suitable carrier system. York also shows effective treatment of ocular wounds in humans by

Art Unit: 1617

administering various aldose reductase inhibitors also disclosed in his parent cases. (see abstract, col 1, lines 25-59; col 2, lines 1-67).

Depiro et al is merely used to show that it is well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a topical or ophthalmic formulation, once in possession of the active ingredient. (see p 42-45, specifically sections under biopharmaceutical and therapeutic considerations). Accordingly, converting a ophthalmic to a topical composition is a matter of optimizing the carrier system.

Thus, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to practice Banknieder's method by administering his aldose reductase inhibitor topically to a site of interest on the skin, because as shown by York, such compounds as aldose reductase inhibitors, can provide their wound healing properties when administered topically. The ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success because, as described by York, aldose reductase inhibitors provide their wound healing effects when administered topically.

In addition, absence of a showing unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to treat a wound in respective studied subjects by any known mechanism of producing a wound, such as punch biopsy, because the ordinary skill in the art would have expected to see the same results in any type of skin wound created on the skin.

The limitation of measuring the wound size is envisaged by a skilled artisan, because a parameter is needed in order to compare resulting wound healing.

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 13-16, 18-19, 25-26, 28-31, 33-35, 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over York US Patent 4,600,717 in view of FDA Guideline No. 38, Guideline For Effective Evaluation of Topical/Otic Animal Drugs, revised Aug 21, 1984, Center for Veterinary Medicine. 8/21/1984, available at fda.gov/cvm/guidance/guideline38.htm. Last visited Sep 2005. ("Guideline No. 38"), Chen US Patent 6,232,341 and DiPiro et al Pharmacotherapy, A Pathophysiologic Approach, 2nd ed. Elsevier Pub, pp. 41-46.

York shows topical administration of aldose reductase inhibitors in suitable carrier system. (abstract, col 2, lines 30-65). York also shows suggests effective treatment of ocular wounds in diabetic humans by administering various aldose reductase inhibitors. (see abstract, col 1, lines 20-59; col 2, lines 1-67). York fails to compare the efficacy of his compositions against other potentially useful agents.

Guideline No. 38 is merely used to show the standard for assessing topical efficacy of candidate drugs. Attention is drawn to section VIII-X, wherein the study format and appropriate control groups are recommended by the FDA to substantiate the efficacy results of any give drug. (see specifically Sec IX).

Chen is used as an example of the Guideline No. 38 in a clinical efficacy study. Chen shows the state of art as to methods of assessing the efficacy of topical therapeutic preparation in treating skin wound comprising creating a wound, applying the drug of interest randomly among animals, comparing the rate of healing and assessing the efficacy of the drug (see example 3, col 5-8). Chen does not teach the

Art Unit: 1617

use of his methodology on comparing the efficacy of topical agents against aldose reductase inhibitors in diabetic animals.

Depiro et al is merely used to show that it is well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a topical or ophthalmic formulation, once in possession of the active ingredient. (see p 42-45, specifically sections under biopharmaceutical and therapeutic considerations). Accordingly, converting a ophthalmic to a topical composition is a matter of optimizing the carrier system.

Nevertheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to use compare aldose reductase inhibitors of York against other potential candidate agents by as described by Guideline No. 38 and exemplified by Chen's methodologies, because as taught by the Guideline No. 38 and Chen, such methods of comparative analysis is well practiced in the art for assessing the cutaneous effects of drugs on ulcer or burn wounds of dermis or epidermis. The ordinary artisan would have had a reasonable expectation in observing positive results comparative results against aldose reductase inhibitors because they are proven to be effective as a wound-healing agent.

The limitation of measuring the wound size is envisaged by a skilled artisan, because a parameter is needed in order to compare resulting wound healing.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 1, 2006 have been considered.

Examiner agrees that dermis/epidermis and ocular tissue are different. However, Depiro et al is merely used to show that it is well within the purview of one of ordinary

Art Unit: 1617

skill in the art to prepare a topical or ophthalmic formulation, once in possession of the active ingredient. (see p 42-45, specifically sections under biopharmaceutical and therapeutic considerations). Accordingly, converting an ophthalmic to a topical composition is a matter of optimizing the carrier system. Therefore, Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Chen is used as an example of the Guideline No. 38 in a clinical efficacy study. Chen shows the state of art as to methods of assessing the efficacy of topical therapeutic preparation in treating skin wound comprising creating a wound, applying the drug of interest randomly among animals, comparing the rate of healing and assessing the efficacy of the drug (see example 3, col 5-8). Chen does not teach the use of his methodology on comparing the efficacy of topical agents against aldose reductase inhibitors in diabetic animals. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to use compare aldose reductase inhibitors of York against other potential candidate agents by as described by Guideline No. 38 and exemplified by Chen's methodologies, because as taught by the Guideline No. 38 and Chen, such methods of

Art Unit: 1617

comparative analysis is well practiced in the art for assessing the cutaneous effects of drugs on ulcer or burn wounds of dermis or epidermis. The ordinary artisan would have had a reasonable expectation in observing positive results comparative results against aldose reductase inhibitors because they are proven to be effective as a wound-healing agent.

Conclusion

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Layla Soroush whose telephone number is (571)272-5008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SREENIVASAN PADMANABHAN
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER